UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
33rd meeting
held on
Friday, 13 November 1992
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 33rd MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. ELARABY	(Egypt)
later:	Mr. PATOKALLIO (Vice-Chairman)	(Finland)

CONTENTS

- Action on draft resolutions under all disarmament items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.33
29 December 1992

ENGLISH

92-61846 2765V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 to 65, 68 and 142 (continued)

ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.12, L.17, L.33, L.36, L.37 and L.41. Action on the other draft resolutions in this cluster - either because of consultations or for other reasons - has been postponed until next Monday.

Before the Committee proceeds to take decisions on these draft resolutions in cluster 4, I shall first call on those delegations wishing to make statements or to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico)(interpretation from Spanish): I wish to speak on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37, under agenda item 54, and entitled "Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty". The draft resolution is sponsored by 91 countries, the 66 which are already listed in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37 and the following: Antigua and Barbuda, Bulgaria, Cuba, Egypt, Germany, Guyana, Italy, Kazakhstan, Lesotho, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zaire and Zambia.

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

The sponsors of the draft resolution would like to intrcduce the following oral amendment. In the eleventh preambular paragraph, which begins "Noting the concerns expressed", we would delete the words from "and, in this context," to "26 October 1991", that is to say, the words "and in this context, welcoming the statement of the Russian Federation when announcing its nuclear-testing moratorium decision on 26 October 1991", and then continue "which noted, inter alia, the environmental benefits and economic savings to be derived" and add the words "from a comprehensive test ban on nuclear testing".

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): It gives me great pleasure to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons". The draft resolution is sponsored by Bangladesh, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka.

Over the years we have expressed deep concern at the threat caused to non-nuclear-weapon States by the nuclear arsenals of nuclear-weapon States. Obviously, the most effective assurance against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons would lie in their complete elimination. However, until this objective is realized, the non-nuclear-weapon States must be provided with a legally binding assurance against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons in order to address their security concerns.

In our view, security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States should be without qualification, not subject to divergent interpretation, and unlimited in scope, application and duration. In the propitious climate that prevails today with the end of the cold war, there can be no reason why such assurances cannot be extended to the non-nuclear-weapon States unconditionally and in a legally binding manner. This is an idea whose time has now come.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17 was prepared along the same lines as General Assembly resolution 46/32, which was adopted by an overwhelming majority in favour with only two abstentions.

The draft resolution reaffirms the urgent need for reaching an agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. It appeals to all States to work actively towards an early agreement on a common approach and, in particular, on a common formula that could be included in an international instrument of a legally binding character to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States.

We hope that it will enjoy the widest support of the Committee.

Mr. CHANDRA (India): I wish to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33, entitled "Convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons".

The draft resolution is presented on behalf of the sponsors, bearing in mind the demand of a vast majority of the international community that, in the improved international climate, all efforts should be exerted towards the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world and complete nuclear disarmament. As a step towards the attainment of this goal, it calls upon the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations to conclude an international convention prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances.

The considerations behind the draft resolution were spelled out by my delegation when introducing it earlier at the current session. A legal agreement prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons would help bring about a qualitative change in security doctrines and policies based on nuclear weapons and lead to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Chandra, India)

Such a draft resolution enjoyed wide support at previous sessions of the General Assembly, and it is our hope that it will continue to attract wide support, so as to express the sentiment that the complete elimination of nuclear weapons remains a priority goal of the international community.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. ERRERA (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to explain the position of the French delegation on draft resolutions A/C.47/L.37, L.12 and L.17.

My delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37, entitled "Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty", for the following reasons.

Because France is a nuclear-weapon State, which opted for a strategy of deterrence based on the possession of independent nuclear forces maintained at a strict level of sufficiency, it has always been guided by two imperatives: on the one hand, the need to contribute to the struggle against the spread of nuclear weapons and to support the efforts of the international community towards disarmament; and, on the other, the obligation to ensure its security, and thus the continuity of its policy of deterrence, with the constraints that this implies, including as regards testing.

(Mr. Errera, France)

It is this twofold imperative that led the French Government to take, this year, the following initiatives regarding the issue of nuclear testing. On 8 April France announced its decision to suspend its nuclear testing until the end of 1992. At the same time, we indicated that France would participate in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban of the Conference on Disarmament. On 23 September, in the General Assembly, the French Minister of State for Foreign Affairs expressed the hope that we would act

"so as progressively to reduce the number and power such experiments." (A/47/PV.8, p. 31)".

Finally, on 3 November, our Foreign Minister proposed that the representatives of the five nuclear-weapon States at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament initiate a process of common reflection on the issue of nuclear testing.

Those various initiatives illustrate a twofold will on our part. The first is a will of restraint, which France has always demonstrated in carrying out its deterrence policy and which, even recently, it manifested by reducing some of its nuclear-weapon programmes. We note with satisfaction that our initiatives regarding nuclear testing have fostered a dynamic process. This finds its expression today in unilateral measures of restraint adopted by most nuclear-weapon States, which thereby show their willingness to take into account the changing international situation. Secondly, there is our will to engage in dialogue with the non-nuclear-weapon States as well as with the nuclear Powers. Indeed if this issue is to be dealt with, an effort by the whole international community is required. It is also a fact that the five nuclear-weapon States have a particular role to play in this area.

That is why, in our view, the time has come to initiate a process of common reflection on the issue of nuclear testing by the representatives of

(Mr. Errera, France)

the five nuclear-weapon States at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. They are in the best position to do that. This will not be negotiation; it will be a process of consultation that takes into account the situation resulting from recent unilateral initiatives.

These consultations will be carried out without prejudice to the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban of the Conference on Disarmament. France expresses the hope that this work, to which we attach great importance, will be resumed at the beginning of next year and will benefit from the convergence of the unilateral initiatives of several nuclear Powers. Indeed, we believe that the dialogue between the nuclear Powers and the dialogue with the non-nuclear-weapon States are not mutually exclusive but should reinforce each other. It is in this spirit that France has put forward its proposal.

Those are the considerations that led my delegation to change its vote this year on this draft resolution. Our attitude will continue to be inspired by a sense of responsibility towards the international community, particularly bearing in mind the important 1995 deadline regarding the extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; by a sense of responsibility for our own national security, which prevents us from ignoring existing instabilities and nuclear capabilities in Europe; and by a sense of responsibility in the search for acceptable solutions that simultaneously exclude the temptation to immobility and take account of the complexity of the issue of nuclear testing.

I should like now to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.12; "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes".

This year France decided, for several reasons, to abstain in the vote on the text submitted to the First Committee.

(Mr. Errera, France)

First, by changing its vote, France wished to underscore that it shares the international community's concern about the future of the fissionable material released by the implementation of the disarmament agreements concluded by the two main nuclear-weapon Powers, as well as about the risks of the dissemination of such material that the break-up of the Soviet Union could entail.

The change in our position should also be interpreted in the light of the recent initiatives taken by France in the areas of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, in the framework of its arms-control and disarmament plan of 3 June 1991: the accession to the non-proliferation Treaty; the adoption of full-scope safeguards as a condition for peaceful nuclear exports; the ratification of Additional Protocol No. 1 to the Treaty of Tlatelolco; the discontinuance or slowing down of some nuclear-weapon programmes; and the suspension of nuclear testing for 1992 and the proposal for common reflection by the representatives of the five nuclear-weapon States at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament on the issue of nuclear testing.

All these initiatives are inspired by France's same policy of restraint, and they demonstrate in a concrete way an attitude of openness and a readiness for international dialogue on all measures likely to contribute effectively to disarmament and non-proliferation.

Consequently, France would not object to the initiation of discussions at the Conference on Disarmament on the issue of the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. However, owing to the current state of international security, the adoption of concrete measures of a global character does not seems feasible at this stage.

(Mr. Errera, France)

Furthermore, France notes that at the regional level the prohibition of the production and importing of fissionable material for the manufacture of nuclear explosive devices has been proposed as a possible measure of non-proliferation, particularly in the Middle East. By changing its vote, France wishes to encourage discussion of such measures by the parties concerned and demonstrates its recognition of the contribution that those parties could make to regional disarmament.

Lastly, I should like to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17, "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

Last year, at the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly, my delegation explained why it had changed from abstention to an affirmative positive vote on Pakistan's draft resolution regarding negative security assurances. On the one hand, the text of the draft resolution had been improved following our proposed amendment; on the other hand, France wanted its affirmative vote to be interpreted both as encouragement to progress in the ongoing negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament on negative security assurances and as confirmation of its commitment to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Errera, France)

This year, for the same reasons, France reiterates its support for the draft resolution introduced by Pakistan. In addition, since last year France and China have acceded to the non-proliferation Treaty (NPT). As many delegations stressed in the general debate, the fact that the five nuclear-weapon States are parties to the NPT creates a new situation which could foster progress on, inter alia, the issue of security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States. Moreover, the fact that this question no longer arises in the same terms as during the cold war would justify its reappraisal in the light of the new international situation.

Like the other nuclear-weapon States, France has already undertaken solemn commitments regarding the non-use or non-threat of use of its nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. But it also attaches importance to a multilateral solution of this problem which would be both equitable and effective. That is why it contributed to the work of the Conference on Disarmament by supporting an approach based on the following elements.

First, until nuclear disarmament is universal, it is legitimate for the States which have renounced the acquisition of nuclear weapons to obtain from nuclear-weapon States assurances against the use or threat of use of such weapons against them.

Secondly, with regard to the form of such an assurance, it is also legitimate that the States which renounce the possession of nuclear weapons by implementing a legally binding and verifiable instrument should expect, in return, legally binding assurances from nuclear-weapon States. It is this concept of mutual legal commitments by nuclear and non-nuclear States that is already at the basis of regional denuclearization agreements such as the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

(Mr. Errera, France)

Thirdly, a legally binding commitment to non-acquisition of nuclear weapons can take several forms. The main one is the non-proliferation Treaty, which provides for the implementation of full-scope International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. It could also be a regional denuclearization agreement, such as the Treaty of Tlatelolco, providing for either a regional verification regime or IAEA safeguards. It could also be a safeguards agreement concluded directly with IAEA, providing for acceptance of non-nuclear-weapon status and the application of full-scope safeguards.

As international experience has shown, it is not enough for a State to be a party to a treaty; it must also scrupulously abide by its commitments under the treaty - hence the importance of adequate verification regimes and of strengthening them as necessary. In any event, in regard to the benefit of legally binding negative security assurances, it would not be normal to put on an equal footing the overwhelming majority of States which accept and comply with non-proliferation commitments and the States that refuse to comply with them or violate them.

When it acceded to the NPT, France indicated that it intended to participate actively in the preparations for the 1995 Conference, which will be crucial for the future of the non-proliferation regime. We consider that progress on the issue of negative security assurances in the direction I have indicated would be an important element for the success of that Conference. That is why France will spare no effort, in particular at the Conference on Disarmament, to contribute to such progress.

Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom has decided to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17, on the conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, as it did in the past on the relevant draft resolution. We do this because the text does not refer clearly to the necessary relationship between a security assurance given by a nuclear-weapon State and the necessity for a binding commitment from recipient States on nuclear non-proliferation, preferably through adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

This relationship is spelt out in our unilateral declaration on security assurances, which is referred to in the draft resolution. The United Kingdom has, however, repeatedly stressed its willingness to continue to consider ways and means to achieve effective international arrangements. We shall continue to negotiate in good faith on this issue at the Conference on Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will vote first on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.12. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.12, "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes", was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 24th meeting, on 3 November 1992, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belarus, Cameroon, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Romania, the Russian Federation, Samoa, Sweden and Uruguay.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: France, India, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.12 was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

---

* Subsequently, the delegations of Latvia and Peru advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: We now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17, "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee, on 13 November 1992, and is sponsored by the following countries: Bangladesh, Colombia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17 was adopted by 139 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33, "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", was introduced by the representative of India at the 28th meeting of the First Committee, on 10 November 1992, and is sponsored by the following countries: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Costa Rica, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, the Lao Pecple's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded voto was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Marshall Islands, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33 was adopted by 97 votes to 21, with 19 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.36. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.36, "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia at the 27th meeting of the First Committee, on 9 November 1992, and is sponsored by the following countries: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.36 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.36 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37 as orally amended.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37, "Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty", as orally amended this morning by the representative of Mexico, was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 24th meeting of the First Committee, on 3 November 1992, and is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, the Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Slovenia, the Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zaire, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: China, France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37, as orally amended, was adopted by 136 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on the last draft resolution scheduled for this morning's meeting, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.41.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.41, "Nuclear-arms freeze", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 28th meeting of the First Committee on 10 November 1992. It is

sponsored by the following countries: Bolivia, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Myanmar and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, China, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Slovenia, Sweden, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.41 was adopted by 92 votes to 18, with 28 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded voting on the draft resolutions presented for adoption this morning. I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position on those draft resolutions.

Mrs. LAOSE-AJAYI (Nigeria): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on A/C.1/47/L.17, "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

We voted for the draft resolution this year, as we did for similar draft resolutions in the past, because Nigeria is a non-nuclear-weapon State that should benefit from the provision of such security arrangements. We would, however, like to point out that the present international situation is auspicious for the conclusion of an effective international arrangement in this regard. My delegation therefore calls upon all States to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty to ensure their unequivocal status as non-nuclear-weapon States and to enable them to be in a position to benefit from such an assurance.

Mr. DEYANOV (Bulgaria): I wish to explain Bulgaria's votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.17, L.33 and L.41.

As in previous years, my delegation voted this year for the draft resolution - A/C.1/47/L.17 - dealing with so-called negative security assurances. Our vote reflects our continuing support for the general concept of legally binding assurances by nuclear-weapon States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States.

However, we continue to have very serious doubts whether the submission of the same, virtually unaltered draft resolution on this issue at a time of radical changes in the international security environment can serve any practical purpose in terms of strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States or enhancing the non-proliferation regime. The General Assembly has been adopting virtually the same resolution for 15 years already, with no

(Mr. Deyanov, Bulgaria)

visible effect on the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament. As one of the countries which voted in favour of the draft resolution, we firmly believe it is high time to change it by orienting it towards options that seem more likely to achieve progress in the new world situation.

In view of the positions held, and adopting a purely pragmatic approach, we feel that there are now real prospects of positive progress on negative security assurances, mainly in the context of preparations for the non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) extension conference in 1995. It is a great pity, therefore, that draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17 did not seek to place, as a first step, the search for an agreement on a common approach, and in particular on a common formula, in the context of the extremely wide circle of non-nuclear-weapon States Parties to the NPT or other equally binding arrangements ensuring a non-nuclear-weapon status.

All nuclear-weapon States have now joined the NPT, which is a very important factor for building the prerequisites of progress. Initial differences of perception, due to the confrontation between blocs of cold war times, are also being overcome, and this process will probably continue in the context of the NPT. Bulgaria therefore strongly favours a change in the approach of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17, which seems to be the preferred course of action by many other States belonging to various regional groups, as seen in today's explanations of vote by the delegations of France, Nigeria, the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Bulgaria. Those familiar with the history of the negative security assurances negotiations are aware that all those countries have made a very positive input to preparations for progress on this important issue.

(Mr. Deyanov, Bulgaria)

Turning now to the other two draft resolutions, I wish to state that Bulgaria was unable to support draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.33, "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons" and A/C.1/47/L.41, "Nuclear-arms freeze", on the grounds that they lack the degree of pragmatism needed in the new security environment.*

---

* Mr. Patokallio (Finland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

(Mr. Deyanov, Bulgaria)

Bulgaria supports the general thrust and objectives of the two draft resolutions. The means of pursuing these objectives, however, seem more applicable to the old cold war times; the situation is now totally changed. The concept of a freeze at a time of agreement on a more than 70 per cent reduction in the nuclear stockpiles of the major nuclear Powers is simply outdated.

On some of the elements of the definition of a freeze used in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.41, we see great merit in following a separate course of action, which is being done in other draft resolutions, some of which my country sponsors. Other elements of the freeze seem either to be in the making or no longer to be topical.

On draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33, my delegation decided to change the vote it cast last year, because it sees in it no interest in taking into account the serious reservations that a number of delegations expressed on a similar draft resolution at the forty-sixth session.

We wish to reaffirm our consistent support for and commitment to the principle of non-use of nuclear weapons. This principle will be fully implemented in the context of a process leading to the complete elimination of these weapons and to making the non-proliferation regime truly universal. At the same time, we realize that the calls for negotiations on a convention to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons contained in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33 and its previous versions have not led to any progress, and there seems to be little chance that they will in the foreseeable future - anyway, not in the radical manner suggested by draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33.

(Mr. Deyanov, Bulgaria)

It was for those pragmatic reasons that Bulgaria voted against draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.33 and A/C.1/47/L.41.

Mr. RICHARDS (New Zealand): I wish to explain our votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.41, "Nuclear-arms freeze" and A/C.1/47/L.17, on so-called negative security assurances.

On the nuclear-arms freeze, I should like to recall that the representative of New Zealand commented on this occasion last year that the concept of a freeze might well have had some beneficial effects at a time when the nuclear-arms race was in progress, but that as we were even by then witnessing the reversal of the arms race it was our view that a freeze was an idea whose time had passed. Since then even more remarkable progress in achieving a reduction in nuclear armaments has been made. While the draft resolution's preambular paragraphs acknowledge this progress, the operative paragraphs seem themselves to have become subject to a freeze. My delegation regrets that a text having its origins so very much in another era is still being submitted to the Committee. That is why New Zealand abstained on the draft resolution. We very much hope that next year the Committee will not have to spend time giving consideration to outmoded concepts such as that proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.41.

I turn to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17. I am taking the draft resolutions out of order because I have the honour to make this statement on behalf of Australia as well as New Zealand.

Australia and New Zealand voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17 concerning the conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use of threat of use of nuclear weapons, or, put more simply, negative security assurances. In

(Mr. Richards, New Zealand)

our view, it cannot be contested that non-nuclear-weapon States should receive effective assurances from nuclear-weapon States that nuclear weapons will not be used or threatened to be used against them.

The other side of this coin, however, is that reasonably to expect to receive such assurances non-nuclear-weapon States must make a clear and unambiguous commitment to the non-nuclear cause by acceding to the non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) and other relevant regional non-proliferation accords, like the Treaties of Tlatelolco and Rarotonga. Accordingly, our delegations would have preferred this aspect - the importance of binding non-proliferation commitments by non-nuclear-weapon States - to be reflected in the text of the draft resolution. We do not think that the issue of negative security assurances can be considered in isolation from broader efforts to strengthen the international nuclear non-proliferation regime. We would therefore encourage the sponsors of this text to reflect further on this aspect when preparing future draft resolutions on this subject.

As we approach the 1995 extension conference for the non-proliferation Treaty, we are optimistic that new opportunities will be available for resolving the negative security assurance debate to the satisfaction of all Parties to the NPT. In the preparations for the 1995 conference, we look forward to considering proposals in this area which build on the greatly improved international environment and the increased climate of confidence that pervades international relations between nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States.

Mr. BRECKON (United States of America): The United States wishes to explain its vote on two draft resolutions.

I begin with draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.12, "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes". The United States

(Mr. Breckon, United States)

traditionally abstained on votes on such draft resolutions in the past; last year, however, it was compelled for the first time to vote against the draft resolution since it attempted - in our view, prematurely - to initiate activity on the issue in the Conference on Disarmament. The United States Government, as part of President Bush's non-proliferation initiative, announced earlier this year that it would not produce plutonium or highly enriched uranium for nuclear explosive purposes. United States policy on the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes has thus fundamentally changed. The United States continues, however, to oppose multilateral action on this issue at this time. For this reason, the United States abstained on the draft resolution today.

The United States delegation did not support draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37, "Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty", because in our view it is not consistent with United States policy in respect of nuclear testing limitations. The United States has been required by recent legislation to suspend all nuclear tests temporarily until well into next year. On 10 July President Bush announced that future United States nuclear tests would be conducted only to evaluate and to improve the safety of its much smaller nuclear deterrent, and to maintain the reliability of United States nuclear forces. In this regard, the United States will conduct only the minimum number of tests necessary for these purposes.

However, during the period in which the testing is suspended the United States will reflect on its future requirements in terms both of the minimal programme needed to maintain safety and reliability and of the relationship of a minimal testing programme to the future of a modest nuclear deterrent. While the need for nuclear testing has been dramatically reduced over the last

(Mr. Breckon, United States)

several years, in conjunction with fundamental changes in the international security environment and deep reductions in nuclear forces, it is our belief that a modest need remains, and in all candour is likely to continue into the future, as long as a modest stabilizing deterrent is required.

The United States remains prepared to discuss all aspects of nuclear testing issues in the Conference on Disarmament, to agree to the establishment of an ad hoc committee on a nuclear test ban under an appropriate mandate and to participate constructively in the work of such a committee.

Mr. SERGEEV (Russian Federation)(interpretation from Russian): We wish to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33 entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". As with similar draft resolutions in the past, the Russian delegation has supported draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33 on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons, and we wish to remind the Committee that under the earlier conditions of global nuclear confrontation, when there were no large-scale measures to reduce or eliminate nuclear weapons, we regarded this proposal as one of the measures that could contribute to progress in nuclear disarmament.

In recent years, however, the situation has changed greatly. We are witnessing fundamental changes in the general nature of international relations which also touch directly on the sphere of nuclear disarmament. In our view, at a time when a process of radical reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons is evolving, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33 should adopt an approach that is more realistic and takes account of the changes that have occurred; otherwise at the next session our delegation will be compelled to review its attitude towards the draft resolution.

Mr. CHANDRA (India): My delegation wishes to express its views on two draft resolutions, namely, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.12 entitled "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes" and draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37 entitled "Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty".

My delegation was constrained to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.12, and I should like to set out the reasons therefor. The Final Document adopted by consensus in 1978 at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament clearly sets out in paragraph 16 the stages for the process of nuclear disarmament. We recognize that the intent

(Mr. Chandra, India)

behind the draft resolution is laudable. However, the partial approach it represents is not in conformity with the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which correctly sets the issue in its totality.

We believe that there should be a simultaneous stoppage in the production of nuclear weapons and all fissionable material for weapons purposes. Only with such a total approach can we introduce a universal, equitable and non-discriminatory system of international safeguards on all our nuclear facilities. In our view, the draft resolution in document A/C.1/47/L.41 on this subject is far more in conformity with the goals set out in the Final Document.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37, we wish to compliment the sponsors on having made every effort to generate support for the draft resolution. The objective of achieving a ban on all nuclear-weapon tests is a long-standing priority for us. It was clearly reiterated in the preamble to the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty. Our vote in favour of the draft resolution is, however, without prejudice to our well-known position on the scope of a comprehensive test-ban treaty to be negotiated in the Conference on Disarmament, as visualized in the preamble to the partial test-ban Treaty.

India had the honour to chair the 1991 Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban in the Conference on Disarmament and to act as Special Coordinator for this item in 1992. Despite every effort on our part and the cooperation of many delegations, the lack of an adequate negotiating mandate was a handicap. We hope that when the Ad Hoc Committee is re-established in 1993, as called

(Mr. Chandra, India)

for in the draft resolution, it will have an adequate negotiating mandate. Meanwhile my delegation invites all nuclear-weapon States to replicate unreservedly the unilateral moratoriums on nuclear-weapon tests announced by some nuclear-weapon States in order to create a propitious atmosphere for those negotiations.

Mr. HU Xiaodi (China)(interpretation from Chinese): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33. The Chinese Government has all along stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and has, since the first day of its possession of nuclear weapons, undertaken not to be the first to use nuclear weapons at any time or under any circumstances and committed itself to not using, nor threatening to use, nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States or nuclear-weapon-free zones. We hope that all nuclear-weapon States can make the same commitment unconditionally and reach a corresponding international agreement as soon as possible, thereby providing a forceful impetus to the process of nuclear disarmament. We hope that China's constructive initiative will receive a positive response.

On the basis of the above-mentioned position of principle, the Chinese delegation is in favour of the main thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33 on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and at the same time wishes to point out that certain elements of the draft resolution and the draft convention annexed to it need to be improved.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia): I wish to explain Australia's votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.33 and A/C.1/47/L.41.

Australia was unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33 on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, which has just been adopted by the

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

Committee. Australia feels that the draft resolution relates to an outdated concept which is a hangover from the days of the cold war. The idea of a convention banning the use of nuclear weapons continues to pose difficulties and would not, we believe, provide a solution to the problem it seeks to address. It is for the reason that Australia has once again voted against the draft resolution.

We note, however, that the end of the cold war has brought about changes in attitude towards the possible use of nuclear weapons and that substantial progress in nuclear disarmament has been achieved over the past year in particular. Australia continues to give its full support to all such efforts.

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

Concerning draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.41, "Nuclear-arms freeze", Australia has once again abstained. We have done so essentially because we do not believe that it takes full account of the important progress in nuclear disarmament that has taken place, including, in particular, the progress over the last twelve months. In view of this progress, we see the concept of a nuclear-arms freeze as being somewhat anachronistic. However, Australia strongly supports all measures to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race, including measures towards the achievement of nuclear-arms reductions, a comprehensive test ban and a cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes.

Mr. BATIOUK (Ukraine): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.36, "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament".

Ukraine joined in the consensus on this draft resolution in order to express its support for the progress that has recently been noted in this field. At the same time, my delegation would like to point out that the title of the draft resolution and, more important, its substance, do not fully reflect the essence of the ongoing nuclear-weapons reduction process, nor does it pay due tribute to the contribution of some newly independent States to that process.

Our second observation concerns the range of States that should be involved in the process. We feel strongly that other nuclear States which until recently preferred to take the position of passive onlookers in the process of reduction of nuclear weapons must have their share and their say in unilateral, bilateral and multilateral efforts. Nowadays we cannot see any valid excuse for any of the known nuclear-weapon States to abstain from the process of negotiated steps leading to the reduction of existing nuclear forces.

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukraine)

For this reason we ask the sponsors of the draft resolution to find appropriate language to ensure the active participation of all nuclear-weapon States in the ongoing process of reduction of nuclear weapons.

Mr. VASILYEV (Belarus) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of Belarus wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.41, "Nuclear-arms freeze".

We supported the draft resolution as a matter of principle. Along with the positive aspects of the draft resolution, there are also provisions which undermine certain other draft resolutions that are now under consideration in the Committee.

It seems to us that the draft resolution does not take full account of the progress made in the area of nuclear disarmament in recent times. Some of the provisions are not entirely realistic. We would urge the sponsors of the draft resolution to take account of these circumstances in future and thereby substantially change the draft resolution. Otherwise, my delegation will be obliged to review its position on this text.

Mr. KIBIDI (Zaire) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Zaire did not this time vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1 47/L.41, "Nuclear-arms freeze". My delegation feels that substantial progress has been made in this area and that the draft resolution does not adequately reflect those efforts. For this reason, my delegation abstained in the voting.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.